Appendix

"It's like shouting to a brick wall": Normative whiteness and racism in the European Parliament

Authors: Johanna Kantola, Anna Elomäki, Barbara Gaweda, Cherry Miller, Petra Ahrens, Valentine Berthet (Tampere University, Finland)

Contents list:

1. Ethics certificates (please see the separate pdf)
2. Interview guides and related protocols used during data collection, including project information sheet and consent forms for interviews and shadowing
3. A description of the analysed documents, including how access was obtained
4. Additional discussion of the research field

1. Ethics certificates

Please see the separate pdf documents attached.

2. **Interview guidelines**

Interview questions – MEPs, general

EUGenDem

23.9.2019 - revised 7.9.2020

I Background

1. If you were to advise a new MEP on how to be an effective MEP in your political group, what would you stress? What's important to understand about the group?

II European Parliament's political groups

2. Could you please describe your everyday involvement with the political group?

3. How would you describe decision-making in the political group?

   What makes a good and effective group leader? Does gender play any role?

4. What's the significance of the political group meeting for you (to clarify if needed: what's a successful group meeting, what's an unsuccessful one)?

   Is something else more important for your work in the political group? For example, working group?

5. How would you describe your party group from the point of view of gender equality more generally?

   What other differences are important?

6. What kind of practices for gender equality do you have within the party group? (quotas, work-life-balance, etc.)

7. How would you describe the impact of COVID-19 on your work as an MEP, on your PG and your relationship to your PG?

8. What is your working relationship with the group leader? (Follow up: Do you have direct access to group leader, do they listen to you? How would you describe the leadership style)?

   What about the Secretary General? (Check whether the leader has changed for this MEP and if they can compare between the leaders)

   How would you describe the relationship between the MEPs and political groups' staff including group staff and APA?

   Do political group statutes play any role for your representative work?

9. How does policy-making work in your group?

   What are your possibilities for influencing group priorities and policies? (Follow up: coordinator's powers in committee X)

   Have you actively put yourself forward to some positions and failed/succeeded? What had an impact on your success/failure?

   How do you persuade people within the group, to whom do you go?

10. Brexit question: What impact did Brexit have on these things in your PG?

11. How would you describe your working relationships to other political groups?

    Have you witnessed any obstructive behaviour between MEPs from different groups?

12. How is it to speak in the plenary? What makes it effective, what hampers it? What is the significance of practices such as blue cards, catch the eye, do you use them, are they important? Are there gender differences?

13. What kind of political conflicts are there within the group? When do emotions get heightened?

    Are people disciplined socially in the political group if they overstep their roles or disagree with others in the group? Does gender play a role?

14. What is the meaning of your Europarty for your work? (How was your last Europarty congress like?)

15. What kind of outside expertise do you use in your work? Do you cooperate with some civil society organisations (related to gender equality)?

    How accessible do you think your political group and its work is to the general public?

16. How do people in your party group get together informally? Does gender play any role? (Venting/debriefing) How do you socialize with your colleagues/peers beyond the political group? Do you have informal support networks?

III Conduct and behaviour

17. Have you witnessed inappropriate behaviour, comments or bullying within the group?

18. To mainstream parties: what practices do you have vis-a-vis radical right populism? What's its impact on your work? Does it have a gender dimension?

19. A question for a feminist e.g. FEMM advisors: Do you ever feel that you are breaking the role to which you are positioned on the basis of your gender? Are there any sanctions? How does it make you feel?

IV Equality in policy contents

20. To what extent is gender equality discussed in relation to key policy issue in your group, for instance in the XX committee team, working group, or in the group meeting? For instance, how has the Istanbul Convention been discussed in your group/committee?

21. Which equality questions are easy to negotiate within the group and form a joint stance? Which are difficult?

V Conclusion

22. Is there anything that I haven't asked about gender equality and political groups that may be relevant for our study?

Interview questions – STAFF, general

EUGenDem

23.01.2020

I Recruitment into national (political party) practices

1. If you were to advise a new staff member on how to be an effective staff member in your political group, what would you stress? What's important to understand about the group?

    a. For APAs: How would you describe your relationship to the MEP you work for? What is the tone of the office like? How would you compare this with other offices you've worked in?

II European Parliament's political groups: Work and views on equality

1. Could you please describe your everyday involvement with the political group?

2. How would you describe decision-making in the political group?

    What makes a good and effective group leader? Does gender play any role?

3. What's the significance of the political group meeting for you (to clarify if needed: what's a successful group meeting, what's an unsuccessful one)?

    Is something else more important for your work in the political group? For example, working group?

4. How would you describe your party group from the point of view of gender equality more generally?

    What other differences are important?

5. What kind of practices for gender equality do you have within the party group? (quotas, work-life-balance, etc.)

6. How would you describe the impact of the 2019 elections on your political group? Formation of your political group and other groups after last elections?

    What kind of impact is Brexit having on your political group and on your political work in the EP?

7. How would you describe the relationship between the MEPs and political groups' staff including group staff and APA?

For SGs: What is your working relationship with the group leader? (Follow up: How would you describe the leadership style)?

8. How does policy-making work in your group?

   What are your possibilities for influencing group priorities and policies? (Follow up: coordinator's powers in committee X)

   How do you persuade people within the group, to whom do you go?

9. How would you describe your working relationships to other political groups?

   Have you witnessed any obstructive behaviour between MEPs or staff from different groups?

10. What kind of political conflicts are there within the group? When do emotions get heightened?

    Are people disciplined socially in the political group if they overstep their roles or disagree with others in the group? Does gender play a role?

11. What kind of outside expertise do you use in your work? Do you cooperate with some civil society organisations (related to gender equality)?

    How accessible do you think your political group and its work is to the general public?

12. How do people in your party group get together informally? Does gender play any role? (Venting/debriefing) How do you socialize with your colleagues/peers beyond the political group? Do you have informal support networks?

13. Have you experienced any challenges in reconciling your work life with family? What practices are there in your party group that would facilitate reconciling work and family? Or make it more difficult?

III Conduct

14. What impact has the MeTooEP had on your political group?

15. Have you witnessed inappropriate behaviour, comments or bullying within the group?

16. To mainstream parties: what practices do you have vis-a-vis radical right populism? What's its impact on your work? Does it have a gender dimension?
17. Do you feel you have been sometimes treated in a different way to others because you work for this group/for this MEP?

18. A question for a feminist e.g. FEMM advisors: Do you ever feel that you are breaking the role to which you are positioned on the basis of your gender? Are there any sanctions? How does it make you feel?

IV Equality in policy contents

19. To what extent is gender equality discussed in relation to key policy issue in your group, for instance in the XX committee team, working group, or in the group meeting?

20. Which equality questions are easy to negotiate within the group and form a joint stance? Which are difficult?

V Conclusion

21. Is there anything that I haven't asked about gender equality and political groups that may be relevant for our study?

Thank you!

EVENT, DATE AND TIME OF EUGENDEM OBSERVATION:

……..

Finalized: ✓ / **X**

Event setting *Date, *Duration, *Location, *Organizers, *PGs represented, *External visitors yes/no, * # to follow on Twitter, *MEPs/Staff in attendance
Power relations *Hierarchy, *Interactions, * Leadership, *Seating arrangements
Democracy *Information-sharing, *(Non) decision-making, *Speaking Time, *Representation, *Transparency
Gendered practices (considered intersectionally) *Division of labour, *Gendered language/ humour, *Valuing expertise, *Embodiment, *Des Rep.

The Political Group as a Workplace *Attendance, *Responsibilities, *Skills and trainings, *Collaborations, *Rules
Affect *****Moments of arousal/intensity/ (dis) engagement *Socio-material environment, *Strong language
Researcher role *Own views, *Reactions, *Comments, *Affects, *Positionality

Information sheet about the Research Project
University of Tampere, Finland

Title of the Study:

Gender, party politics and democracy in Europe:
A study of European Parliament's party groups

Principle Investigator:	Professor Johanna Kantola	Affiliation:	Tampere University, Finland
Researcher:	Dr. Cherry Miller	Affiliation:	Tampere University, Finland

Purpose of the Study

Gender, party politics and democracy in Europe: A study of European Parliament's party groups (EUGenDem) is an academic research project funded by the **European Research Council** (ERC) Consolidator Grant (2018-2023) and based at the University of Tampere, Finland.

The purpose of the study is to study European Parliament's political groups' practices and policies from a gender perspective. This means studying questions such as: which factors either advance and hinder women and men's political careers within the political groups.

Ultimately, this research may be presented as conferences papers, or published academic books and journal articles.

Benefits of the study

The benefits of the research are for the society to better understand how the European Parliament's political groups potentially are shaped by gender relations. If these are unequal to any gender, they can be addressed as a result of this study.

Data collection

Our research data involves a lot of written public **documents** but we also conduct **interviews** in the parliament with MEPs, their assistants and EP's personnel. In addition, we undertake **participant observation** in public events and public meetings. We also undertake some participant observation in some closed meetings if we are given the permission. In these cases, everyone who participates in the meetings is informed before-hand. All the data that we collect is anonymised and no one can be recognised at any stage. All data is also stored securely. When making field notes during participant observation no personal data (such as names or nationalities) is recorded.

Right to Ask Questions and Report Concerns

You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by us before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact us, Cherry Miller at cherry.miller@tuni.fi or by telephone at +358 50 4377559. If you have any other concerns about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, you may contact Heikki Eilo, Ethics Committee Secretary at Tampere University ethical board at heikki.eilo@tuni.fi, or by telephone + 358 49 1901389.

Contact details

Professor Johanna Kantola

Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Tampere
Finland

Email: johanna.kantola@tuni.fi
Phone: + 358 50 4377045

Dr Cherry Miller

Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Tampere
Finland

Email: cherry.miller@tuni.fi
Phone: + 358 50 4377559

For more information about the research project please visit our website:
https://research.uta.fi/eugendem/

European Research Council
Established by the European Commission

Consent to Participate in a Research Study
University of Tampere, Finland

Title of the Study:
Gender, party politics and democracy in Europe: A study of European Parliament's party groups

Principle Investigator:	Professor Johanna Kantola	Affiliation:	University of Tampere, Finland
Researcher:		Affiliation:	
Researcher:		Affiliation:	

Thank you for agreeing to be **interviewed** for the purposes of the research project: Gender, party politics and democracy in Europe: A study of European Parliament's party groups (EUGenDem), University of Tampere, Finland, and funded by the European Research Council Consolidator Grant (2018-2023).

We would kindly ask you to read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be interviewed.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to study European Parliament's political groups' practices and policies from a gender perspective. This means studying questions such as: which factors either advance and hinder women and men's political careers within the political groups.

Ultimately, this research may be presented as conferences papers, or published academic books and journals.

Interview procedures and confidentiality

This interview will last from 30 minutes to 2 hours. It will be recorded with your permission and later transcribed. The interview data is fully confidential. We will guarantee your full anonymity. You will have the opportunity to see the citations we might later use in research. The interviews will be used only for the purposes of this research project.

We will not include any information in any report we may publish that would make it possible to identify you.

The records of this study will be kept strictly confidential. Research records will be kept in a locked

file, and all electronic information will be coded and secured using a password protected file.

Benefits of the study

The benefits of participation are for the society to better understand how the European Parliament's political groups potentially are shaped by gender relations. If these are unequal to any gender, they can be addressed as a result of this study.

Payment

Please note that there is no payment or reimbursement for this interview.

Right to Refuse or Withdraw

The decision to participate in this study is entirely up to you. You may refuse to take part in the study *at any time* without affecting your relationship with the investigators of this study. You have the right not to answer any single question, as well as to withdraw completely from the interview at any point during the process; additionally, you have the right to request that the interviewer not use any of your interview material.

Right to Ask Questions and Report Concerns

You have the right to ask questions about this research study and to have those questions answered by us before, during or after the research. If you have any further questions about the study, at any time feel free to contact us, Johanna Kantola at johanna.kantola@uta.fi or by telephone at +358 50 4377045. If you have any other concerns about your rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigators, you may contact Heikki Eilo, Ethics Committee Secretary at Tampere University ethical board at heikki.eilo@uta.fi, or by telephone + 358 49 1901389.

Consent

Your signature below indicates that you have decided to volunteer as a research participant for this study, and that you have read and understood the information provided above. You will be given a signed and dated copy of this form to keep, along with any other printed materials deemed necessary by the study investigators.

Subject's Name (print): _____

Subject's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Investigator's Signature: _____ Date: _____

3. **Description of documents used in the article**

The documents used in this article consisted of i) the European Parliament's Rules of Procedure and other European Parliament level rules governing the functioning of the Parliament, and ii) the statutes and rules of procedure of the European Parliament's political groups. All European Parliament level documents are publicly available on the European Parliament's website. The statutes and/or rules of procedure of some political groups are publicly available on their website (e.g. ID Group; Greens/EFA). For other political groups, these are non-public internal documents. They were obtained through asking for them through email or during interviews.

4. Research field

The EUGenDem project team collected data in two extensive qualitative fieldwork periods: October 2018-May 2019 and December 2019-March 2020. The team jointly developed questionnaires for MEPs and political group staff as well as an ethnographic observation protocol, also responding to the changing circumstances and updating the interview schedules with questions on current developments (European Parliament elections in 2019; Covid-19 restrictions and their implications for parliamentary work). After Covid-19, interviews were conducted online between March 2020-March 2022. Interviews were recorded with the permission of the interviewee. If the request to record was declined by the interviewee then the interviewer took notes. The interview data is fully confidential and interviewees were guaranteed full anonymity.

In total, the team interviewed 140 MEPs and staff in the European Parliament; reaching gender parity among the interviewees; covering all eight political groups and the Parliament secretariat. Ethnographic fieldwork allowed the team to gain a fine-grained understanding of (in)formal political group dynamics. In total, nine MEPs were shadowed, and ten group meetings accessed. During the main data collection period, a two-month placement at the European Parliament's Research Service allowed by-appointment targeted observations in political groups, as well as other activities in the European Parliament. Overall, this amounted to 55 days, 440 hours in the field.

The team collected a wealth of internal documents from the European Parliament and the political groups on their practices and policies, including the political group statues listed in the bibliography and quoted in the article. The documents fed into the context and interview analysis.

The team has several publications on the qualitative research methods explaining the process and benefits of parliamentary ethnography. These include:

- Miller, Cherry (2022). '"Ethno, ethno, what?" Using ethnography to explore the European Parliament's Political Groups in Contested times' in Petra Ahrens, Anna Elomäki, and Johanna Kantola (eds.) *European Parliament's Political Groups in Turbulent Times.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Miller, Cherry (forthcoming). 'Between Westminster and Brussels: Putting the "Parliament" in Parliamentary Ethnography'. *Politics & Gender*. Accepted for publication.
- Miller, Cherry (2020). 'Parliamentary Ethnography and Feminist Institutionalism: Gendering Institutions – But how?' *European Journal of Politics and Gender. https://doi.org/10.1332/251510820X16007078930609*